



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,170	06/20/2003	Andy Peichl	7781.0083-00	7610
22852	7590	09/23/2008		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER WONG, ERIC TAI WAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,170

Applicant(s)

PEICHL ET AL.

Examiner

ERIC T. WONG

Art Unit

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 1 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/517344.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims recite a system comprising a central processing unit; input/output means; at least one database containing human resource data relating to human resource objects; and a commitment engine; said commitment engine retrieving human resource data from said at least one database and evaluating a human resource budget for a given human resource object for a predefined period of time based on said retrieved human resource data, said commitment engine further storing a result of said evaluation, monitoring said human resource budget during said predefined period of time. Claim 1 of the '170 application additionally recites providing an automatic notification to a user based on the monitoring, which is an obvious difference. This is

a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 16 and 23 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 14 and 21, respectively, of copending Application No. 10/517344. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the claims recite methods and computer program products for retrieving human resource data and evaluating a human resource budget for a given human resource object for a predefined period of time based on said retrieved human resource data; and storing and monitoring said human resource budget during said predefined period of time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 16-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

6. For purposes of § 101, a "process" has been given a specialized, limited meaning by the courts. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under § 101 since it is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In addition to being tied to another

statutory class, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876). Claims 16-22 are neither tied to another statutory class nor do they transform underlying subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Examiner's note: Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the **entire** reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the content of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 13-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033211 A1) in view of Ross (US Patent No. 6,026,390 A).

9. Examiner notes that certain components of the system claims are defined by functional language (eg. module for...). The limitations are therefore only given weight to the extent that the prior art is or is not capable of performing the recited functions.
10. Regarding claim 1, Haines teaches a central processing unit; input/output means; at least one database containing data relating to objects (figure 5 elements 504, 508, 530). Haines further teaches evaluating a budget for a given object for a predefined period of time based on retrieved data from the database; storing a result of the evaluation, monitoring the budget during the predefined period of time, and providing an automatic notification to a user based on the monitoring (see paragraphs 139-140). Haines does not teach using the invention to monitor a human resource budget. Ross teaches budgeting for human resources (column 3 lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the budget monitoring of Haines to include budgeting for human resources. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification since it is the application of a known technique to a known method ready for improvement to yield predictable results, the predictable results being ascertaining the difference between budgeted expenses and actual expenses.
11. Regarding claim 2, Haines teaches retrieving objects from said at least one database, collecting data from said at least one database, and writing updated budget data to said at least one database.
12. Regarding claim 4, Haines does not teach using human resource data consisting of position data and individual data. Ross teaches using human resource data consisting of position data and individual employee data (see figure 6 "Emp" table). Examiner notes that applicant also admits that human resource data administration often involves maintaining a database with personnel data such as employee number, position, salary, possible benefits (gratuities, bonus payments, stock options etc.) salary history, pension information etc. (see

paragraph 3 of specification). As discussed above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the budget monitoring of Haines to include budgeting for human resources, further using human resource data consisting of position data and individual data. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification since it is the application of a known technique to a known method ready for improvement to yield predictable results, the predictable results being ascertaining the difference between budgeted expenses and actual expenses.

13. Regarding claims 13 and 14, Haines teaches spending based on a difference between said potential budget and an actual budget. Haines does not teach hiring for human resource positions only while under the human resource budget. Ross teaches budgeting for employees with a human resource budget. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the spending based on a difference between potential budget and actual budget of Haines to be limited to a human resource budget for employees as taught by Ross. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification in order to avoid overspending the budget.

14. Regarding claim 15, Haines does not teach re-evaluating a budget based on recognized changes to data that are relevant to the budget. Ross teaches re-evaluating a budget based on recognized changes to data that are relevant to the budget (see column 3 lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the budget monitoring system of Haines further to include re-evaluating the budget based on recognized changes to data that are relevant to the budget as taught by Ross. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of budgeting accuracy. Further, it would have been obvious to automate the process in view of *In Re Venner* (120 USPQ 192, 194; 262 F2d 91 (CCPA 1958)).

15. Regarding claims 16 and 23, Haines teaches retrieving data and evaluating a budget for an object for a predefined period of time based on said retrieved data; and storing and monitoring said budget during said predefined period of time (see [0140]). Haines does not teach applying the invention to human resource budgeting. Ross teaches budgeting for human resources (column 3 lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention to have modified the data retrieval, evaluation, storage and monitoring of Haines to include budgeting for human resources as taught by Ross. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification since it is only applying a known technique to a known method ready for improvement to yield predictable results, the predictable results being knowing the difference in what has been spent versus what has been budgeted.

16. Regarding claims 17 and 24, Haines teaches reserving an amount of money according to said evaluated data (budget).

17. Regarding claims 18 and 25, Haines teaches continuously adapting said reserved amount of money by subtracting one or more effected payments (remaining budget).

18. Regarding claims 19 and 26, Haines teaches performing, based on a budget preparation, a reservation step (budget), then performing a pre-commitment step based only on retrieved data (budget), and then performing a commitment step for objects based only on retrieved object data (remaining budget), and a subsequent adaptation of the one or more results of said respective prior steps (remaining budget).

19. Regarding claims 20 and 27, Haines teaches reserving an amount of money for said predefined period of time based on said results of said commitment step (remaining budget).

20. Regarding claims 21 and 28, Haines teaches continuously adapting said results of said pre-commitment and commitment steps based on changes to said data (remaining budget).

21. Regarding claims 22, and 29, Haines teaches continuously adapting said results of said pre-commitment and commitment steps based on changes to said object data ([0139-0140], remaining budget).
22. Regarding claims 30 and 32, Haines does not teach using human resource data including human resource position data and human resource object data. Ross teaches using human resource data including human resource position data and human resource object data (see figure 6 "Emp" Table). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the budget monitoring of Haines to include using the human resource data including human resource position data and human resource object data as taught by Ross. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modifications because knowing the cost for items in a budget is necessary and said human resource data is essential to determining the cost of each employee.
23. Regarding claims 31 and 33, Haines teaches an automatic notification to a user based on said monitoring (see [0139-0140]).
24. Regarding claim 34, the claim recites limitations similar to those found in claim 1 (see rejection of claim 1 above). The claim additionally recites that the human resource data includes pre-commitment data concerning both vacant and occupied positions. Ross teaches pre-commitment data concerning both vacant and occupied positions. The pre-commitment data concerning occupied positions is the salaries of the employees in the department. The data concerning vacant positions is the budget itself.
25. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines in view of Ross, further in view of Williams (US Patent No. 5,600,554).

26. Regarding claim 3, Haines teaches said commitment engine further comprising a creator module for creating budget control documents (Figure 14, elements 1406 and 1420), a transfer module for transferring budget data to an exterior accountancy (see [0140]), said administrator module administering data flow to and from said creator and said transfer modules. Haines does not teach an error handling module for handling errors and triggering workflows to overcome an error. Williams teaches handling errors and triggering workflows to overcome an error (column 7 lines 9-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the budget monitor of Haines to include an error handling module for handling error and triggering workflows to overcome an error as taught by Williams. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because it is useful to correct errors.

27. Claims 5-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines in view of Ross, further in view of Official Notice.

28. Regarding claim 5, Haines and Ross do not teach calculating an individual employee salary based on said retrieved human resource data. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention to include calculating an individual employee salary based on retrieved human resource data (eg. calculating a salary using an hourly rate). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification since it is useful to calculate expenses for different periods of time, or different budgeting periods.

29. Regarding claims 6 and 7, Haines teaches monitoring a budget during a period of time and providing an automatic notification to a user based on said monitoring. Haines does not

teach combining several of individual employee salary budgets into a department or cost center budget. Ross teaches combining several of individual employee salary budgets into a department or cost center budget (see column 3 lines 55-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the budget monitoring system of Haines further with combining several of individual employee salary budgets into a department or cost center budget. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because categorization allows for budgeting more efficiently.

30. Regarding claim 8, Haines et al teaches monitoring the budget during said period of time.

31. Regarding claims 9 and 10, Haines does not teach wherein said monitoring involves a comparison of said calculated individual employee salary budgets with one or more actually effected salary payments. Ross teaches comparing employee salary budgets with one or more actually effected salary payments (column 3 lines 55-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the budgeting system of Haines further with comparing individual employee salary budgets with one or more actually effected salary payment. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification for the benefit of determining those expenses which exceed the budgeted amounts.

32. Claims 11-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines in view of Ross, further in view of Visual Rota ("Cash Budgets & Budgetary Control").

33. Regarding claims 11-12, neither Haines nor Ross explicitly teach calculating one or more position cost simulations for one or more employee positions based on position data and calculating one or more employee cost simulations for an existing employee based on individual

employee data. Visual Rota teaches calculating one or more position cost simulations for one or more employee positions based on position data and calculating one or more employee cost simulations for an existing employee based on individual employee data (see "Indirect Costs", "Using Budgetary Control in Visual Rota"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Haines further with including one or more position cost simulations or one or more employee cost simulations, the sum of the simulations being the potential or actual budget. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because simulations are an effective way at projecting costs.

Response to Arguments

34. Applicant argues that Haines is incapable of being modified to include setting up a human resource budget for an entire department because it only budgets for listed items for a specific customer. Applicant argues that the system of Haines is incapable of allocating for resources outside of purchasing listed items, for example, incoming and outgoing employees, changing employee benefits, stock option purchasing, insurance, etc. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Haines teaches a budgeting system which allows for monitoring of budgets while Ross teaches a system which is capable of monitoring human resource budgets. Haines may only be a budgeting system for a consumer making purchases. However, Ross teaches budgeting for human resources which includes allocating for resources outside of purchasing listed items, for example, incoming and outgoing employees. Examiner asserts that

the system of Haines is capable of being modified to monitor a human resource budget as taught by Ross, and one of ordinary skill in the art would surely be able to make the proposed modification.

35. Applicant further argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have reason to combine Ross's budgeting for employees in a department into Haines's analyzing and budgeting consumer purchases of specific product. Applicant argues that incorporating Ross into Haines would destroy the purpose of Haines's purchase incentive program. Examiner disagrees. Examiner has relied upon Haines insofar as it provides a budgeting system which allows for monitoring and notification. The fact that the Haines application may go on to describe a purchase incentive program is irrelevant. Haines still constitutes analogous art because it is reasonably pertinent to the same problem being solved, that problem being monitoring a budget. Applicant further argues that the combination would be providing a consumer with the ability to monitor human resource data and a consumer would not be concerned with this type of monitoring. Examiner disagrees since the combination would most certainly be useable by a human resources manager.

36. Examiner previously took Official Notice regarding claim 5, which recites calculating an individual employee salary based on retrieved human resource data. Applicant traverses this rejection, saying that the Official Notice fails to overcome the deficiencies of Haines and Ross since, at most, it only provides calculating an employee salary. Examiner would like to provide clarification to the Official Notice taken. Ross teaches retrieving human resource data which includes an individual employee salary. It was old and well known in the art at the time of invention that a salary may be calculated based on an hourly rate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the human resource data to include an hourly rate instead of a flat salary and calculating the salary based on that hourly rate.

37. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 11 and 12 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC T. WONG whose telephone number is 571-270-3405. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

ERIC T. WONG
Examiner
Art Unit 3693

September 17, 2008